

9
2
APR 19 1933

Agricultural HISTORY

Volume VII—Number 1

JANUARY

1933

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

by

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY
SOCIETY

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Published Quarterly by the Agricultural History Society

President: ULRICH B. PHILLIPS, Yale University.

Vice-President: L. C. GRAY, United States Department of Agriculture.

Secretary-Treasurer: O. C. STINE, United States Department of Agriculture.

Editor: EVERETT E. EDWARDS, United States Department of Agriculture.

Associate Editors: HERBERT A. KELLAR, McCormick Historical Association, Chicago; O. C. STINE, United States Department of Agriculture; CLARIBEL R. BARNETT, United States Department of Agriculture; KATHLEEN BRUCE, College of William and Mary; G. E. FUSSELL, British Ministry of Agriculture; W. SEEDORF, Instituts für Landwirtschaftliche, Betriebs- und Landarbeitslehre an der Universität Göttingen.

CONTENTS

Horace Greeley and the Beginnings of the New Agriculture

Earle D. Ross 3

Horace Greeley: Land Reform and Unemployment, 1837-1862

Roy M. Robbins 18

News Notes and Comments

42

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY is designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included, and also materials on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

Correspondence concerning contributions and books for review may be sent to Everett E. Edwards, Room 3035, South Building, 13th and B Streets, S.W., Washington, D. C.; correspondence concerning membership dues and business matters, to O. C. Stine, at the same address.

Agricultural History is sent to members of the Agricultural History Society. Annual membership, \$3.00; life membership, \$100.00. A list of the articles in earlier numbers of Agricultural History will be found on the inside back cover. Single numbers and back files may be obtained from the secretary.

The Agricultural History Society assumes no responsibility for statements, whether of fact or of opinion, made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter, October 12, 1928, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

VOLUME VII, NUMBER 1, January, 1933

CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Earle D. Ross ("Horace Greeley and the Beginnings of the New Agriculture") has been associate professor of history at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, since 1923. He is a graduate of Syracuse University (Ph.B., 1909; Ph.M., 1910) and Cornell University (A.M., 1912; Ph.D., 1915), having studied at the University of Wisconsin during 1913-14. Before going to Iowa State College, he taught at a number of Middle Western colleges, including North Dakota Agricultural College. He is the author of *The Liberal Republican Movement* (New York, 1919), and the editor (with L. B. Schmidt) of *Readings in the Economic History of American Agriculture* (New York, 1925), and has also contributed articles to various educational and historical journals. Especially noteworthy is his study of "The Evolution of the Agricultural Fair in the Northwest," in the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, 24: 445-460 (July, 1926) and "Squandering Our Public Land," in the *American Scholar*, January, 1933. Recently he has been making a study of the agricultural interests and policies of great American leaders. His "Roosevelt and Agriculture" appeared in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 14:287-310 (December, 1927); "Benjamin Franklin as an Eighteenth Century Agricultural Leader," in the *Journal of Political Economy*, 37:52-72 (February, 1929); and "Lincoln and Agriculture," in *Agricultural History*, 3:51-66 (April, 1929).

Dr. Roy Marvin Robbins ("Horace Greeley: Land Reform and Unemployment, 1837-1862") has been assistant professor of history at Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, since 1929. He received his B.A. degree from Earlham College in 1925 and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Wisconsin in 1926 and 1929. He was assistant professor at the University of Washington (Seattle) during 1928-29 and the summers of 1930 and 1932. He became interested in the history of the public domain while a graduate student with Professor Frederic L. Paxson at the University of Wisconsin. His article entitled "Preemption: A Frontier Triumph," appeared in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 18:331-349 (December, 1931).

HORACE GREELEY AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NEW AGRICULTURE

EARLE D. ROSS

However inapt, in many respects, the poet Whittier's characterization of Horace Greeley as "our later Franklin," the two great journalists had in common a lifelong interest in agriculture. Both were naturally attracted to the occupation, by their economic and social philosophy no less than by their scientific curiosity. There was, however, a vast difference in their approach to the soil. Franklin, a city boy, turned to the country only when established in life and able to play the rôle of gentleman farmer,—albeit in an unusually serious way. The later popular champion came of a struggling backcountry family and had a realistic background that left him "without any romantic or poetic notions of Agriculture as a pursuit." His grandfather's holdings ranged in value from a thousand dollars to nothing, and his father was sold out for debt. In pioneer New Hampshire and Vermont and in the clearings of western Pennsylvania he had experienced American farm life in its most inhospitable aspects. From personal experience he was aware of the extent to which the tiller of the soil was the victim of acts of God and human wiles.¹ He observed a neighbor old at forty, dying at fifty, "worn out with excessive and unintermitted labor,"² and his own sister, after a life of privation and suffering, still absorbed in "a round of drudgery."³ It was not so much the hard work, he felt, in retrospect, as the lack of vision and of intelligent, progressive incentive. "Not that they toil, but that they toil so hopelessly."

Literate rural New England of his boyhood had had no true

¹ *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 34-60, 77-80 (New York, 1868); *What I Know of Farming*, 183-184 (New York, 1871).

² *What I Know of Farming*, 255.

³ To Mrs. R. M. Whipple, Aug. 25, 1863 (Greeley Papers, Library of Congress).

appreciation and understanding of its main interest. "I cannot remember," he complained late in life, "that I had ever seen a periodical devoted to farming, up to the day wherein, in my sixteenth year, I abandoned the farm for the printery. A book treating of Agriculture, or seeking to set forth the *rationale* of its processes, the natural laws on which they are based, I certainly had not seen. Nay, more: during the ten or twelve years in which I attended school, more or less, I never saw a treatise on Chemistry, Geology, or Botany, in a school-room. I hardly saw one anywhere. That true Agriculture is a grand, ennobling science, based on other sciences, and its pursuit a liberal, elevating profession, was not even hinted, much less inculcated, in any essay, speech, or sermon, any book, pamphlet, or periodical, so far as I then knew. Farming, as understood and practised by those among whom I grew up, was a work for oxen; and for me the life of an ox had no charms."⁴

Given but a taste of the possibilities of the farmer's calling, he was convinced that he would have followed it with profit and joy. In a career peculiarly free from illusions he kept steadfastly to this one, if such it was. A wistful regret near the close of his stressful career iterates this conviction and casts doubt upon Gamaliel Bradford's assertion that the editor's approach to nature was wholly practical.⁵ "I should have been a farmer. All my riper tastes incline to that blessed calling whereby the human family and its humbler auxiliaries are fed. Its quiet, its segregation from strife, and brawls, and heated rivalries, attract and delight me . . . were I now to begin my life anew, I would choose to earn my bread by cultivating the soil. Blessed is he whose day's exertion ends with the evening twilight, and who can sleep unbrokenly and without anxiety till the dawn awakes him, with energies renewed and senses brightened, to fresh activity and that fulness of health and vigor which are vouchsafed to those

⁴ *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 295-296.

⁵ *As God Made Them*, 140 (Boston, 1929). This essay on Greeley originally appeared as an article, "Horace Greeley," *American Mercury*, 1: 385-393 (April, 1924). Cf., Don Carlos Seitz, *Horace Greeley, Founder of the New York Tribune* (Indianapolis, 1926), and Constance Mayfield Rourke, *Trumpets of Jubilee*, 241-365 (New York, 1927).

only who spend most of their waking hours in the free, pure air and renovating sunshine of the open country."⁶

Greeley was constantly urging relatives and acquaintances to seek these satisfactions. Such a career he would have selected for a son,⁷—probably with the usual parental futility,—and apparently he backed unsuccessful farming ventures of a nephew.⁸ The Boswellian Reavis, who sought his idol as a fellow editor, was urged to sell his paper and go to farming.⁹ He was distressed that a friend was thinking of quitting his farm "in favor of public business" when he would have been "glad to make a change in the opposite direction." At his friend's age, he was convinced, it was "very unwise to quit the life of a farmer for any other whatever."¹⁰ To the same correspondent he wrote some years later: "I am vexed that I cannot urge men as intelligent as your brother and Harvey Hawes to become missionaries of the gospel of Agricultural Progress."¹¹

While feeling that his public work had "claims to which Comfort must defer," Greeley did his best to compensate for the life of the husbandman. To the query of captious critics as to why the *Tribune* people, if they believed so strongly in farming, did not go to the country, he responded: "*We do*. Every one of us who can afford it has his home in the country, and spends there all the time that he can snatch from pressing duties, and hopes for the day when he can enjoy there more and more hours of each week, and ultimately all of them."¹² The chief himself set the example, even before he could get out of the city limits. In 1845 "on a plat of eight acres, in what was then the open country skirting the East River . . . the neighborhood . . . as rural and secluded as heart could wish" he demonstrated conclusively his theory as to the folly of shallow plowing.¹³

⁶ *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 295.

⁷ *What I Know of Farming*, 183.

⁸ To Horace Greeley 2d, Oct. 29, 1872 (Greeley Papers).

⁹ L. U. Reavis, *Representative Life of Horace Greeley*, 544 (New York, 1872).

¹⁰ To Mrs. R. M. Whipple, March 8, 1864 (Greeley Papers).

¹¹ Jan. 15, 1871, *ibid*.

¹² *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Dec. 7, 1869.

¹³ *What I Know of Farming*, 87-88.

Established in life, financially and domestically, he sought a real farm. Beginning with an initial purchase in 1853 he gradually acquired an estate of some seventy acres in Westchester County,—“the ragged edges of two adjacent farms.” Conforming to his wife’s requirements, which sacrificed the agronomic for the aesthetic, the suburban acreage had insuperable productive limitations, but, like Arthur Young’s “hungry vitriolic gravel,” it offered unusual experimental opportunities. Drainage, irrigation, fertilization, crop rotation, horticulture, and concrete construction all aroused his interests and efforts.¹⁴ The results of these personally planned and supervised experiments furnished the basis of his agricultural writings and lectures. But, above all, the “rocky, wooded hillside” at Chappaqua was a refuge from the trials of journalism and politics and here the great publicist spent his most contented hours. He had no illusions as to the costs and wastes of the enterprise,—“my farm wants to send me to the Poor-house,” he wrote in the midst of his early building,—but he never doubted that it afforded the best life available to a metropolitan editor and lecturer. “I have done good work on it,” he wrote the year before his death, “and the results are (in part) enduring and visible. . . . I have a permanent interest in nothing else compared with this.”¹⁵ In view of the purposes which the estate served so well, much of the criticism of Greeley’s impractical farming ventures was lacking in point; but, as it was, the editor could maintain that, in essential respects, his procedure was in accord with the best practices of the time.

Whatever Greeley himself might think about it, with his broad social interest and wide popular appeal, his main contribution to agriculture was not as a model farmer. As the *New England Farmer* observed in 1859, if the founder of the *Tribune* had fol-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 62, and *passim*; *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 296-309; O. B. Capen, “Country Homes of Famous Americans; Horace Greeley,” *Country Life in America*, 8: 58-61 (New York, 1905).

¹⁵ To Mrs. R. M. Whipple, Jan. 15, 1871 (Greeley Papers). On his farm interests and experiences, see his letters to Mrs. Whipple, May 16, 1869; to Mrs. Emma W. Newhall, May 19, 1857, two, 1857 (?), 1860 (?); to Mrs. Margaret Allen, June 17, 1861; John G. Shortall reminiscences; reminiscences of his brother, Barnes Greeley, all in the Greeley Papers.

lowed the peaceful, retired career for which he longed, he could never have reached his vast rural constituency.¹⁶ His contribution to this, as to other good causes, was that of the agitator journalist, author, and lecturer.

From the first the *Tribune*, with its large circulation in country districts throughout the East and West, gave much attention to the conditions and problems of agriculture. In 1853, it took the lead among metropolitan journals in the establishment of a distinct farm department in its weekly edition. Special horticultural and veterinary sections were later added. The department provided a summary of agricultural happenings and an intelligent discussion of a wide variety of farm problems. The latest agricultural books were reviewed and extended essays printed. In 1859, James Caird's letters on "Prairie Farming in the West" appeared, and the following year the meetings at which the first course of Yale agricultural lectures was delivered were reported by a special staff member and the lectures printed in full. In the preface to the published lectures the author, Henry Steel Olcott, expressed his appreciation to the *Tribune*: "Occurring as it did when there was an unusual pressure upon the columns of the paper, the Convention would never have been reported at all if the editors had not regarded with great favor this attempt to improve the condition of our Agricultural science."¹⁷ Among the staff writers and contributors were Solon Robinson, James J. Mapes of the celebrated New Jersey school,¹⁸ Nathan C. Meeker, Patrick T. Quinn, Henry S. Olcott, and James Law.

In addition to the more specialized articles, the editor sent letters from his travels at home and abroad and gave frequent editorial observations and advice to his farmer readers, the comparative resources and opportunities of different regions, analyses of crop prospects and harvest returns, domestic and foreign, the

¹⁶ *New England Farmer*, 11:22 (Boston, 1859).

¹⁷ *Outline of the First Course of Yale Agricultural Lectures*, preface (New York, 1860).

¹⁸ "It is not unlikely that much of Greeley's interest in agriculture, that led to the founding of the *Tribune Farmer*, was acquired from his visits to the Mapes farm." C. R. Woodward, *The Development of Agriculture in New Jersey*, 139 (New Brunswick, N. J., 1927).

best utilization of forage and surplus grain crops, what to do in winter months, and, early in the war, a three-column dissertation on the "Curiosities of Indian Corn."

The *Tribune* also gave loyal and cordial support to the agricultural press. Its department was held to be not a substitute for such periodicals but rather, by giving suggestions that might be more fully followed up, an incentive to read the professional journals.¹⁹ The pioneer *Monthly Journal of Agriculture*, which John S. Skinner edited, was published by Greeley and McElrath.²⁰ A considerable number of the numerous magazine articles which Greeley wrote dealt with farming and rural life.²¹ He also contributed the article on "Agriculture" to *Johnson's Universal Cyclopedia*, of which he was joint editor.

The publication and distribution of books on agricultural science, which were just beginning to accumulate in the sixties, were greatly promoted by the *Tribune*. The company was publisher or agent for works by such pioneer writers as Henry L. Ellsworth, Colonel George E. Waring, A. J. Downing, P. T. Quinn, J. S. Rarey, H. S. Olcott, and Thomas Ewbank.

All of Greeley's own books on social reform, industry, and travel dealt with phases of agriculture; but his most deliberate and inclusive statement, embodying his experiences and observations, was in a series of essays contributed to the *Tribune* in 1870 and collected in book form under the title, *What I Know of Farming: A Series of Brief and Plain Expositions of Practical Agriculture as an Art Based upon Science*. The book was designed, not as a technical treatise, but as a practical guide for the average farmer. As such it was wholly realistic, without the sentimentalism that characterized the literature of country life introduced in this period by the essays of Donald G. Mitchell. Ridiculed as were the author's farming ventures, the essays, based upon first-hand observation, checked by references to leading authorities, brought together in popular and convenient form the best ideas of the day, and, at the same time, set forth a wholesome social philosophy.

¹⁹ *New York Weekly Tribune*, May 14, 1853.

²⁰ W. E. Ogilvie, *Pioneer Agricultural Journalists*, 7 (Chicago, 1927).

²¹ See the incomplete bibliography in the University of the State of New York, *Memorial to Horace Greeley*, 249-256 (Albany, 1915).

The editor reached his constituency more directly by addresses, mainly at fairs, in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Middle West. In 1871, in response to an invitation to speak at the Texas state fair, he made a notable tour of the South which afforded a new basis of observation and comparison.²² While recognizing the limitations of such presentations, amid the distractions and competing attractions of show pen, midway, and race track, he continued to fill these fall engagements up to the tragic presidential canvass. Whether from the value of his addresses or the appeal of his personality, fair managers rated the *Tribune* editor in the forefront of available speaking talent.²³ In a simple, forceful manner, and, at times, with an almost startling frankness, he stressed his basic ideas. The most pretentious of the addresses had a considerable circulation in pamphlet form under the title, "What the Sister Arts Teach as to Farming."

Greeley was an enthusiast for agricultural societies, recognizing, in the years before organized experimental and extension activities, their basic place in agricultural advancement. The editor personally reported the first fair of the reorganized New York society and took every opportunity to emphasize the educational possibilities of state and local exhibitions. Before the day of fair associations, the *Tribune* served as a sort of unofficial organ, listing dates and giving full accounts of exhibits. But the fairs of his day, Greeley felt, were falling far short of their opportunity as educational agencies. Managers too often did not take their duties seriously and the majority of spectators came to be entertained rather than instructed. He proposed that a larger and more representative group of exhibitors be secured, that premiums be offered for general proficiency in farming, and that the inspirational and political addresses be replaced by informal explanations of exhibits and

²² *Letters from Texas and the Lower Mississippi* (New York, 1871); E. D. Ross, "Horace Greeley and the South, 1865-1872," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 16:333-334 (Durham, N. C., 1917).

²³ *What I Know of Farming*, 225; *New York Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 15, 1853; *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Sept. 10, 1858; *New England Farmer*, 6:52-53 (Boston, 1854); *Iowa State Register*, Sept. 23, 1871; *New York State Agricultural Society, Transactions*, 1860, p. 431, 1864, p. 525; letter to John H. Stevens, Aug. 16, 1863 (Greeley Papers).

practical discussions at evening meetings.²⁴ Pseudo fairs promoted by racing interests were denounced in the editor's choicest invective.²⁵

In the pre-Grange days the farmers' club seemed to offer the best basis of organization for regular social and educational contact, as co-operative organization did for economic advantage. One of the *What I Know of Farming* essays is devoted to the organization and activities of such societies. In 1843 Greeley helped to establish the New York Farmers Club as a branch of the American Institute. His horticultural prizes in connection with the club's annual exhibits led to much rivalry and were widely discussed in the agricultural press.²⁶

As a self-made man, Greeley was doubtful of general collegiate training. He cited the careers of Franklin, Washington, Jackson, Clay, and Lincoln as evidence that such training was not essential to leadership,²⁷ and held that by apprenticeship "most boys may thus better acquire the knowledge they need than by spending four years in college."²⁸ In preparation for farming a poor boy would do far better to secure training by farm labor and self-study than to attend an agricultural college. With backcountry philosophy he maintained that such a boy could not "wisely consent to spend the best years of his life in getting ready to live."²⁹

But Greeley understood too well the changing vocational con-

²⁴ *What I Know of Farming*, 225-230.

²⁵ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, July 17, Aug. 7, Oct. 30, 1857.

²⁶ When Greeley became president of the Institute in 1866 he secured an act from the legislature to extend its activities "to print and circulate throughout the United States documents relating to Agriculture, Manufactures and Commerce; and to use any other means to make the said Institute *national* in its influence and character." E. F. Murdock, "The American Institute," in F. W. Wile, editor, *A Century of Industrial Progress*, xii (Garden City, N. Y., 1928). On the Greeley prizes, see *Country Gentleman*, 25:175 (Albany, N. Y., 1865); *Cultivator and Country Gentleman*, 27:142, 270-271 (March 1, April 26, 1866); *American Agriculturist*, 24:236 (New York, 1865). See also, memorial proceedings of the Farmers' Club in Tribune Association, *A Memorial to Horace Greeley*, 59-61 (New York, 1873). He was an active member of the United States Agricultural Society. H. B. Learned, *The President's Cabinet*, 320 (New Haven, 1912); True, *op. cit.*, 98.

²⁷ "Greeley's Estimate of Lincoln," *Century Magazine*, 42:372 (New York, 1891).

²⁸ *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 64.

²⁹ *What I Know of Farming*, 32-33.

ditions,—as the nation was getting away from the frontier and the industrial revolution was proceeding at accelerated pace,—to be controlled by youthful prejudices. He recognized the need of a new education for the new day in agriculture, as well as the social benefit of broadening the basis of higher education. As a matter of record, Horace Greeley was an outstanding leader in the Industrial Movement in American education. He endorsed Jonathan Baldwin Turner's plan for an industrial university in Illinois³⁰ and was a founder of the Peoples College in his own state, after securing an extension of the original plan to include agricultural instruction. At the dedication of this institution he summarized the fundamental aims of the new education as a provision for training in the applied sciences for the vocations, comparable to that in the classics for the professions, "a perfect combination of Study with Labor," and educational opportunity for women.³¹

From the introduction of the first Morrill act the *Tribune* was a consistent and enthusiastic supporter of the land-grant college proposal, and reported with great fullness and general approval the initial developments in organization and courses of study.³² To a certain type of critic of the early agricultural and mechanical colleges he replied pointedly and cuttingly: "None are more apt to inveigh against the shallowness or quackery of our current applications of science to agriculture, than they who bar the way

³⁰ *New York Tribune*, Feb. 26, 1853, cited by A. C. True, *History of Agricultural Education in the United States*, 91-92, 98 (Washington, 1929).

³¹ *Peoples College. . . Addresses*, 43-46 (New York, 1859); True, *op. cit.*, 54, 56, 174; *New York Weekly Tribune*, April 23, 1853; *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 513. In a fair address at La Fayette, Indiana, in 1853, he urged that state to establish a similar institution. W. M. Hepburn, and L. M. Sears, *Purdue University*, 14 (Indianapolis, 1925).

³² *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, April 9, 1858, March 1, 1859, July 24, 1868, March 30, Oct. 19, Dec. 31, 1869, Jan. 4, 1870, Sept. 8, 1871; *New York Tribune*, May 27, 1862. Greeley hoped that the new university at Lawrence, Kansas would be built far enough out from the city "to give scope for a Model Farm, and for a perfect development of the education of the brain and the hands together. In our old states, the cost of land is always assigned as a reason for not blending labor with study authoritatively and systematically; here there can be no such excuse." See *An Overland Journey from New York to San Francisco*, 43 (New York, 1860). Following his connection with the People's College, he became a charter trustee of Cornell University; see W. T. Hewett, *Cornell University*, 1:41-43, 46-48, 53-54, 88, 90-93, 141 (New York, 1905).

to our advance to the acquisition of a science of agriculture which shall be neither shallow nor empirical."³³

In view of the ridicule which has been cast upon Greeley's agricultural agitations and activities, contemporaneously as well as in later times, a consideration of the soundness of his ideas is pertinent. In such an appraisal it must be recalled that the applications of science to agriculture on an extended scale were still tentative and uncertain, and, that for a nation with a supposed well-nigh inexhaustible frontier, popular interest in new methods lagged far behind that in older countries. A speaker at an Ohio fair in 1860 hardly exaggerated the uncertainty of prevailing thinking: "Every question of the science and practice of Agriculture, such as plowing, draining, drilling, quantity of seed per acre, time of harvesting, cutting hay, feeding, manuring, and so on through every labor of the farm to sowing the seed again, is in doubt and uncertainty, and on almost any of these various questions two parties could be arrayed nearly equal in numbers."³⁴

And, on a particular subject, Greeley could write a decade later: "We ought to know exactly what lands are enriched by Gypsum, and what, if any, are not; why these are fertilized, why those are not, by a common application; how great is the profit of such application in any case; and what substitute can most nearly subserve the same ends where Gypsum is not to be had. I admit all you claim, and do not doubt that there shall yet be a Scientific Agriculture that will fully answer your requirements. As yet, however, it exists but in suggestions and fragments; and attempts to complete it by naked assertions and sweeping generalizations tend rather to mislead and disgust the young farmer than really to enlighten and guide him."³⁵

Like most enthusiasts, Greeley had his fads and biases, but

³³ *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 512. "I would sooner be President of the first State Agricultural College than to be President of the United States," he wrote to Joseph R. Williams in 1857. See W. J. Beal, *History of Michigan Agricultural College*, 37 (East Lansing, 1915).

³⁴ Ohio State Board of Agriculture, *Report*, 1860, p. 455.

³⁵ *What I Know of Farming*, 117. L. H. Bailey lists but 14 agricultural text books, of all sorts and grades and including one French translation, published the United States before 1875. *Cyclopedia of American Agriculture*, 4:383-385 (New York, 1907-09).

he based his main propositions upon the foundation principles of Liebig and S. L. Dana and the authoritative conclusions of scientific associates like Mapes and Waring,—far more dependable guides in their respective fields than Henry C. Carey in economics. Necessarily, he shared in prevailing fallacies and misconceptions, such as the crude notions about soil physics and chemistry, and exaggerated or impracticable schemes of general irrigation, soil sewage disposal, excessively deep plowing, and steam traction. His fundamental maxims,—intensive cultivation with systematic rotation, adapted fertilization and liming, under-drainage, careful planning of farm layout, and special attention to the perennial problem of fencing,—if simple, were sound and dependable. In many of his conservation views, especially in his zeal for forestation, he was quite modern. Still more up-to-date was his vision of the mechanization of farming operations. The machine driven by natural power, steam, or electricity, he foresaw, was to work a revolution on the farm comparable to that made in the factory.³⁶

Again, in advance of his time, Greeley gave unusual attention to the business side of agriculture. In pioneer settlement and in farming regions with small capital, co-operative organization seemed to him to afford the most available resource.³⁷ His emphasis upon the proper adjustment of land and capital investment went to the basis of a typical American problem. While he did not agree with Edmund Morris and other small-farm enthusiasts that five or ten acres were “enough” for a “genuine farm,” he deplored the country’s besetting sin of increasing acreage at the expense of desirable improvements.³⁸ As a basis for determining proper outlays and for checking returns, systematic records were essential. In view of the emphasis placed upon this matter at the present day, it is of interest to note that his pioneer treatise devoted a chapter to “Accounts in Farming.”

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 237-247, 280-285; *New York Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 16, 1852, Feb. 5, 1853; *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, March 9, 1866, Sept. 15, 1871; *Glances at Europe*, 286-292 (New York, 1851).

³⁷ *What I Know of Farming*, 24, 240, 248-254; *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, April 16, 1858, May 8, 1868, Aug. 31, 1869, Sept. 1, 1871, Feb. 20, 1872.

³⁸ *What I Know of Farming*, 35-36, 312.

On the marketing problem the writer of 1870 had as definite, if no more definitive, suggestions as many later writers. The statement that "the machinery whereby the farmer of our day converts into cash or other values that portion of his products which is not consumed in his house or on his farm, seems to me lamentably imperfect," illustrated by the maladjustment between rotting fruits and vegetables and the consuming needs of the masses in the cities,³⁹ seems a leaf out of current discussion.

Like observers of the present, Greeley was better at pointing out weaknesses than in prescribing remedies. From time to time the *Tribune* urged the revival of market fairs,⁴⁰ an institution that had fallen into disuse since the early part of the century. Still more original, not to say quixotic, was the editor's proposal that "solvent, well-managed" railroads should purchase at their stations all the available produce of the region and dispose of it immediately in the nearest city. This system, he argued, would greatly increase freight and at the same time stabilize prices at a relatively high level and, since competitors would be free to enter the market, there would be no danger of monopolistic control.⁴¹ At best, it is evident that such a plan would have been limited to suburban areas, and to a small range of products.

Greeley, with all his alertness to the passing scene and with his crusading zeal for industrialization, held to the traditional American view of national reliance upon the continued dominance of the basic occupation. As early as 1854 he was looking to the new scientific methods "to stem and reverse the current which now sets so strongly away from the plow and the scythe toward the counter and the office."⁴² For the average individual, farming was the safest enterprise, far surer than the speculative risks of trade or the fortuitous gains of mining ventures.⁴³ A free outlet

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 297-301.

⁴⁰ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, May 13, 1859, April 20, 1860.

⁴¹ *What I Know of Farming*, 301-302.

⁴² Letter on front advertising page of G. E. Waring, Jr., *Elements of Agriculture* (New York, 1854).

⁴³ *What I Know of Farming*, 184-185; *An Overland Journey from New York to San Francisco*, 123-124, 143-148 (New York, 1860); *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, May 15, 1866, March 19, 1867, July 16, 1869. After commenting on the ruin of mer-

to the land was the chief safeguard against the Old World slum, and the best guarantee of a prosperous, manly, independent citizenry.⁴⁴ While recognizing, as few contemporaries did, the errors and inadequacies of existing practices and standards, Greeley's outlook was hopeful and confident and his matured views gave no justification for James A. Garfield's assertion that "his recent chapters on farming are lamentations rather than eulogies."⁴⁵

To a national-visioned Whig, the government's obligation to aid directly in overcoming the weaknesses and in maintaining and extending the benefits of its agricultural society was self-evident. The public domain should be granted to actual, permanent settlers, encouraged to locate in co-operative colonies, and for such enterprises of essential common interest as agricultural colleges and transcontinental railroads.⁴⁶ Improved highways, scientifically constructed and administered by centralized districts, should connect the farms with the marketing cities.⁴⁷ The prime purpose of protective tariffs was to build up nation-wide industries that would provide a stabilized home market.⁴⁸

The *Tribune* was an early and persistent agitator for a federal department of agriculture. Upon the creation of the commissionership it generally refrained from the widespread criticism of the incompetent head, but upon his death demanded a department with adequate powers, competent direction, and national outlook.⁴⁹

chants, professional men and mechanics in the panic of 1857, the editor added: "Happily, we have Agriculture to fly to, and to such as seek it it will be found like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 13, 1857.

⁴⁴ *What I Know of Farming*, 185-188; *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 217; *New York Weekly Tribune*, Dec. 4, 1847, Nov. 4, 1851, May 15, 1852; *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, May 10, Nov. 10, 1857, Jan. 24, 1868, Feb. 2, Dec. 24, 1869.

⁴⁵ B. A. Hinsdale, editor, *Works of James Abram Garfield*, 1:640 (Boston, 1882).

⁴⁶ *Hints toward Reforms*, 311-317 (New York, 1850); *An Overland Journey from New York to San Francisco*, 384-386 (New York, 1860); *New York Weekly Tribune*, July 29, 1854; *New York Tribune*, May 27, 1862, June 4, 1863.

⁴⁷ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, April 3, 1866.

⁴⁸ *Essays Designed to Elucidate the Science of Political Economy*, 133-145, 149, and *passim* (Philadelphia, 1869).

⁴⁹ *New York Weekly Tribune*, May 15, 1852; *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Feb. 16, 1866, June 25, 1867.

More direct regulatory measures were not overlooked. The railroads which had been established by public bounty should not be allowed to exploit that public. Neither the states nor the federal government, he contended in 1871, had given up the right of regulation and Congress and the state legislatures concerned should proceed to fix rates for the protection of the farmers who were dependent on these utilities.⁵⁰

In the post-war period, just on the eve of the Granger uprising, Greeley was greatly concerned at the waning influence of agriculture upon state and national legislation, as evidenced by the steadily decreasing number of farmer members. General farming was closely confining, and public service meant a consequent sacrifice. And when a rural leader did go to Congress or a state legislature he was disheartened and disgusted at the maze of legal technicalities in which he found himself. The result was a domination, in both spheres, of city and corporate interests. The popular tribune longed for a return to a rural leadership with the old virility along with a modern outlook: "First of all we need that noble old order of Cincinnati revived and infused with the force and sagacity of railroad times; we require a class of men who love the plow as Cincinnatus did but who also love their country as he loved Rome. . . In a word the Republic needs to have its laws, whether local or general, made by farmers who are shrewd and able as well as honest, men whose hands are clean and who are quick to scent a tainted air, and to know who have itching palms; with address to unite the rural interest, which is the paramount and permanent interest, against the money of great cities and the hugging of great corporations."⁵¹

In his attitude toward the extension of federal activity Greeley was as modern as in his views of scientific production and business

⁵⁰ Address at Minnesota State Fair, *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Sept. 15, 1871.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 4, 1870. Andrew D. White likewise deplored "the want of a due representation of the agriculturists and mechanics among the men of power and influence," and urged as a means of training for rural leadership the requirement of social science and literature courses in the agricultural college curriculum. See New York State Agricultural Society, *Transactions*, 1868, p. 66 (Albany, 1869).

management. In replying to objections to the chartering of a transcontinental railroad, he declared in 1859: "We must 'limit, limit, limit' the scope of Federal power and patronage says J. S. P. The caution comes too late. With a constantly and rapidly expanding area of territory, it is certain that Federal power cannot be limited. Every year will create imperative necessities for its growth and expansion."⁵²

The Sage of Chappaqua thus provides a connection between simple pioneer individualism and modern mechanized capitalism. His career culminated in the years of transition from the agricultural to the industrial nation, when the forces of the agrarian revolution, more particularly the application of science, voluntary organization, and governmental activity, were just beginning to be felt. The nation was still living in the presence of an unexploited frontier. Greeley, while of necessity drawing his ideas from and motivating his efforts by the conditions of his time, was sufficiently critical and forward-looking to make definite contributions to all of these transforming influences, and, as a nationalistic leader of social vision and passion, to leave observations and suggestions that have a direct interest for the present.

⁵² *Ibid.*, Jan. 21, 1859.

HORACE GREELEY: LAND REFORM AND UNEMPLOYMENT, 1837-1862

"Go West, young man, go forth into the Country."

ROY MARVIN ROBBINS

The year 1836 found Horace Greeley the editor and joint-owner of a none too successful literary sheet, the *New Yorker*. A happy society luxuriating in prosperity was oblivious of his editorial efforts. Greeley, satisfied with existing conditions, was praising the goodness of everything and everyone.¹ Only occasionally was his attention diverted to the theme of politics. He found little fault with the social and economic structure of the country, and all classes received substantial support in his paper. Even the principle of speculation was upheld as safe and sound.²

Then came the Panic of 1837. Banks suspended specie payments, industry slowed down, and the country found itself in the throes of a great business depression. It would seem that something was wrong with the economic and social structure of the country. The discouraging situation sorely needed constructive criticism and Greeley was prepared to give it. His oft-repeated epigram, "Go West, young man, go forth into the Country," dates from the beginning months of the year 1837.

On April 27, 1837, Greeley warned his friends in the West that they might expect to be overwhelmed with newcomers. The pecuniary troubles, high rents, dear living, and the reduced demand for labor would drive many to emigration who had never dreamed of it. He advised "every laborer, of whatever trade, to take up the march for the new country. . . . If he go prepared to throw off his coat, fare rudely, work heartily, sleep soundly, and rise reasonably, he will likely thrive there. . . . Ahem!"³

¹ *New Yorker*, Oct. 15, 1836.

² *Ibid.*, Feb. 18, 1837.

³ *Ibid.*, April 22, 1837.

At least twenty thousand mechanics and thirty thousand seamstresses, he declared, were unemployed in New York City alone, and ought to be in the West. These laborers had a winter in prospect of fearful, unexampled severity. "Do not wait to share and increase its horrors. Fly—scatter through the country—go to the Great West—anything rather than remain here. . . . Away then, hardy adventurers, to Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin . . . the West is the true destination."⁴ He preached emigration not as a cure for the distresses of the time, but as an alleviation of their most malignant consequences.

As might be expected, few people heeded Greeley's advice. His prediction of a terrible winter was fulfilled. There was untold misery among the unemployed. "As the cold months wore slowly on, the sufferings of the poor became so aggravated, and the number of unemployed increased to such a degree, that the ordinary means were inadequate to relieve even those who were destitute. . . . Some died of starvation. Some were frozen to death. . . . There had never been such suffering in New York before."⁵ That winter Greeley lived in the sixth ward, "then eminent for filth, squalor, rags, dissipation, want and misery."⁶ He was too poor to give money for the relief of the suffering, but he served on one of the visiting committees appointed to canvass his ward. "I thus saw extreme destitution more closely than I had ever before observed it," he declared. Worst of all was the pitiful plea of stout, resolute, single young men and women who answered: "We do not want alms; we are not beggars; we hate to sit here day by day idle and useless; help us to work, we want no other help: why is it that we have nothing to do?"⁷

The conditions incident to the Panic of 1837 made Greeley a socialist even more perhaps than the wretched environment of his youth. He pondered over them for two decades, their memory constantly rankling his brain to action. In 1837, he demanded restriction of immigration and revision of the naturalization laws,

⁴ *Ibid.*, June 3, 1837.

⁵ James Parton, *The Life of Horace Greeley*, 165-166 (Boston, 1889).

⁶ Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 145 (New York, 1869).

⁷ *Ibid.*

claiming that paupers were arriving in New York City at the rate of a thousand a day,⁸ but his old plea for laborers to take up agriculture remained his leading proposal.⁹ Throughout the year 1838 when he began the publication of the *Jeffersonian*, Greeley supported the farming industry. His ardor for the West as a haven for young men never waned.¹⁰

The failure of the country to return to better times forthwith caused many people to join the crusade for reform. No phase of American life, no matter how insignificant, escaped these individuals, eager to build a new Columbia. Many of the intellectuals of the country studied conditions in England, fearing that the United States might follow in her footsteps. In 1840, Greeley published a series of articles by William Ellery Channing in his new weekly, the *Log Cabin*.¹¹ This series entitled "The Elevation of the Working Classes" was spiritual in its appeal, yet the author concluded with the stern economic advice that improvement in steam navigation would soon place Europe and America side by side. Channing hailed this development, but asked, "what is to be the effect of bringing the laboring classes of Europe twice as near as they are now. . . . Anything, everything should be done to save us from the social evils which deform the old world. . . . One thing is plain, that our present civilization contains strong tendencies to the intellectual and moral depression of a large portion of the community."¹²

Before the Harrison campaign of 1840, Greeley had become a Whig, looking to Henry Clay as his political idol. Thurlow Weed, as manipulator of the Whig Party, solicited Greeley's services in editing the campaign journal, the *Log Cabin*. Traditionally the Whigs were associated with the aristocratic interests of the country, but in 1840, they made an open plea for the laboring classes, and Greeley joined whole-heartedly in support of their cause.¹³

⁸ *New Yorker*, June 17, 1837.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Sept. 23, Oct. 7, 1837.

¹⁰ *Jeffersonian*, June 16, 23, 1838.

¹¹ *Log Cabin*, May 9 to July 18, 1840.

¹² *Ibid.*, July 18, 1840.

¹³ Both Webster and Harrison appealed to the laboring classes. See *ibid.*, Sept. 5, Oct. 3, 1840.

First, according to Greeley, the currency problem must be solved in the interests of the working masses.¹⁴ Secondly, a protective tariff was sorely needed to raise the standards of American labor.¹⁵

In 1842 Greeley embraced a new idea, a project in conflict with the philosophy of Whig leaders. Radical, extreme, and foolish in the eyes of most Americans, it was quite in keeping with his unbounded interest in the struggle of the lower classes. While groping for some solution of the nation's ills, he became acquainted with Albert Brisbane, an earnest advocate of Fourieristic socialism, who had just returned from France. Apparently Greeley came under his influence in 1840, for the word "phalanx," an expression of Fourierism, appeared in *Log Cabin* editorials for that year.

However, it was not until 1842 that Greeley included Brisbane's ideas in the columns of the *Weekly Tribune*, the paper launched the previous year by merging the *New Yorker* and the *Log Cabin*. As yet he had not wholly accepted Fourierism as a cure for all ills, for during this time he was still advising the redundant population to "go into the country" and advocating the formation of emigrant companies to aid poor men to move West.¹⁶ Yet he challenged those who ridiculed Brisbane's socialistic endeavors: "Do not stand there quarreling with those who have devised or adopted a scheme which you consider absurd or impracticable, but take hold and devise something better. For, be assured, friend! that this generation will not, must not pass without the discovery and adoption of some method whereby the *Right to Labor* and to receive and enjoy the honest reward of such labor, shall be secured to the poorest and least fortunate of our people."¹⁷

For three years Greeley preached a new order of society with Brisbane's socialistic ideas as its basis. Despite criticism from all sides, and especially from Thurlow Weed and other Whig leaders, he even went so far as to accept the presidency of the North American Association in 1844. At this time Brisbane was busily engaged in developing Brook Farm. All sorts of reforms

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 26, 1840.

¹⁵ *New York Weekly Tribune*, Jan. 1, 5, Nov. 12, 1842.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, July 23, 1842; April 6, 1843.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, July 20, 1843.

found support in the *Tribune*, the Greeley heresies even embraced the antirenters, the Economites of Pennsylvania, the Zoarites and the Shakers. However, in 1847, after a series of printed debates with Henry J. Raymond of the New York *Courier and Express*, Fourierism was dropped abruptly from the columns of the *Tribune*.¹⁸ Either he found that it jeopardized his political connections with the Whig Party, or he came to believe that Brisbane's ideas were impracticable.

In 1844, Greeley became interested in George Henry Evans, a labor leader whose hopes for a new industrial order had been undermined by the Panic of 1837. Realizing the inefficacy of gaining the desired ends by organizing labor, Evans, in the early forties, resolved upon the idea of free land as a means of attracting the redundant population westward, and consequently bringing about higher wages and better working conditions for the laboring man in the eastern industrial areas. For many years the public domain had been regarded as the safety valve of the American political and economic order.¹⁹ In 1841, the westerners secured the passage of the Preemption Act, an agrarian measure which democratized the land system, legalized trespassing on the public domain, and allowed persons who had settled a quarter-section of land the preference of buying that land at the established minimum price to the exclusion of all other persons.²⁰ With the eastern laboring interests launching a crusade for free land in 1844, the time seemed ripe for an East and West agrarian alliance. The West naturally favored free land; it was the logical consequence of the preemption victory of 1841. The success of such a union would depend very largely upon the strength of eastern

¹⁸ *Association Discussed; or, The Socialism of the Tribune Examined* (New York, 1847). These debates are printed in Charles Sotheran, *Horace Greeley and Other Pioneers of American Socialism*, 192-219 (New York, 1915).

¹⁹ In the first labor newspaper in America, printed in 1828, there appeared a labor memorial to Congress in which one of the demands was for free land. See *Mechanics' Free Press*, Oct. 25, 1828, quoted in John R. Commons, and others, editors, *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, vol. 5, Labor Movement, 43-45, 46-47 (Cleveland, 1910).

²⁰ Roy M. Robbins, "Preemption, A Frontier Triumph," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 18:331-349 (December, 1931).

labor forces, for the East was the stronghold of conservatism, a region of manufactures, employers, and property holders fearful of all leveling influences and determined upon maintaining the established order.

That Horace Greeley, supporter of Whig principles and the exemplar of Clay conservatism, should connect himself with this radical, agrarian movement for Land Reform seems almost incredible. His deep humanitarian feeling is the explanation of his crusade for free land. Throughout 1844 and 1845 Greeley carefully watched the activities of Evans and his crusade to establish "the Right to Labor and the Right to the Soil." The reports of the workingmen's associations and their conversion to Land Reform were printed in the columns of the *Tribune*. To the charge by the *Courier and Express* that he was a "Fourierist, an Agrarian, and an Infidel," Greeley replied, "We admit and insist on the *legal* right of the owner of wild lands to keep them uninhabited forever, but we do not consider it *morally* right that he should do so when land becomes scarce and subsistence for the landless scanty and precarious. . . . yes, . . . something will be done, in spite of any stupid clamor that can be raised about 'Infidelity' and 'Agrarianism,' to secure future generations against the faithful evils of Monopoly of Land by the few."²¹

On October 1, 1845, the World's Convention of Reformers met in New York City, adopting as their motto, "Let's All be Unhappy Together." Robert Owen was elected president of the gathering. John A. Collins, in diagnosing the nation's ills, said, "All agree that society is sick—very sick—but few can agree as to the nature of the complaint whether it is dispepsia or dropsy—headache or heartache. . . . But all agree in one thing—that it is high time to send for the doctor." L. W. Rychman insisted that the lands are owned by society,—that "the only true title to land is the obligation to cultivate." George Henry Evans declared in favor of free land, representing the plea of his organization of National Reformers. And finally, Alvan E. Bovay

²¹ *New York Weekly Tribune*, Aug. 4, 1845. For a discussion of Horace Greeley and the National Reform Association, see B. H. Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies*, 358-365 (New York, 1924).

"contended for the right of every individual to a free use of the soil for the purposes of subsistence."²²

Greeley was more than lukewarm in his sympathy for the principles of these reformers. He studied the columns of Evans's paper, *Young America*; he attended their weekly meetings; and finally, when they decided to enter politics by nominating individuals for the state elections, he reprinted their ideas in the *Tribune*. Placards reading "Vote Yourself a Farm" were distributed everywhere.²³ They also aspired to form a true American party which would advocate the cessation of public land sales and the establishment of the principle of allowing every landless man a quarter-section from the public domain.²⁴ If this measure could be enacted, wealth would consist of the accumulated products of human labor, instead of the "hoggish Monopoly of the products of God's Labor;" and it was thought that strife between capital and labor would then cease.

On October 14, 1845, the Industrial Congress of Workingmen met and the Young Americans were admitted into the Industrial Brotherhood.²⁵ The principles of the Land Reformers were incorporated in the platform of the Industrial Brotherhood, and thus organized labor became a sponsor of the Land Reform movement.²⁶ The eastern Land Reformers, by mustering the strength of the workingmen's associations of New England and the Middle States, attracted much attention, but as yet they lacked a real spokesman for their cause. Evans, in his *Workingman's Advocate*, together with a number of other reform papers, could not gain the consideration of all the classes. Greeley had not, up to this time, accepted the cause of the Land Reformers. After an attack by the *New York Courier and Express*, Greeley openly denied support of the Land Reformers and dared the *Express* to state just why it opposed the idea of free land.²⁷

²² *Ibid.*, Oct. 11, 1845.

²³ See Commons, *op. cit.*, 7:305-307.

²⁴ *New York Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 18, 1845.

²⁵ Evans's followers were called Land Reformers, National Reformers, Young Americans, etc.

²⁶ *New York Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 25, 1845.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Dec. 6, 1845.

When the winter of 1845-46 brought intense suffering to the less fortunate in New York City, Greeley once more championed their cause. He estimated the number of jobless at thirty thousand heads of families, and called attention to the daily increases from immigration.²⁸ This problem of destitution was peculiar to New York City alone, no other American city having a similar amount of poverty. Therefore, it was difficult for the rest of the country to understand Greeley's plea. Still under the influence of Fourierism, he proposed the erection of a charitable institution on an estate two miles square with workshops, cotton and woolen factories, and surrounded by farms. He asked for private aid and demanded a public levy, but these bounties would serve only as temporary expedients. He advised the unemployed to go to the farming districts, but the unemployed did not respond to his "back to the farm" ideas. None had money to buy land, and few knew anything about farming.

Under such conditions Greeley decided to risk a new adventure, one which he hoped would prove more successful than his participation in the Fourieristic movement. On January 23, 1846, he stated the problem and made his resolution: "Every day's reflection inclines us more and more to the opinion that the plan of holding and settling the Public Lands of our Union proposed by the little band who have taken the name of 'National Reformers' is the best that can be devised. . . . This system, with such modifications and safeguards as wisdom and experience may suggest would rapidly cover the yet unappropriated Public Domain with an independent, substantial yeomanry, enjoying a degree of Equality in Opportunities and advantages such as the world has not seen. . . . Secure all, so far as possible, a chance to earn a living; then if they *will* run away from the Soil and shiver and starve in cities, why there is no help for them but such as Charity will afford. But shame on the laws which send an able, willing man to the Alms-House or to any form of beggary when the Soil on which he would gladly work and produce is barred against Poverty and accorded by this Government of

²⁸ *Ibid.*, Jan. 3, 1846.

Freedmen to those alone who have money to pay for it, and therefore are to some extent able to do without it."²⁹

This new proposal brought a storm of objurgation and vituperation from the opposition press. The *Express* declared that "the *Tribune* certainly deserves the cap and bells."³⁰ From the *Goshen Democrat* came the statement: "If the plan should be adopted, we should soon have the whole contents of European poorhouses emptied down upon our fertile West." To this Greeley replied in a two-column editorial: "If 'the whole contents of European Poor-Houses' are to be 'emptied down' on us *anywhere* we certainly prefer that they should be planted on our Public Lands rather than in our Alms Houses."³¹ Similar attacks appeared in the *Buffalo Commercial Advertiser* and the *Boston Daily Mail*, the latter declaring, "We think it is much better in the long run for, that a man should purchase his land, and pay for it, than take it as a *pauper entail*."³²

The fire of the opposition newspapers continued throughout 1846. In July, Greeley, boldly addressing the New York Constitutional Convention, asked that august body to declare itself in favor of Land Reform, adding that "To save the Public Lands from . . . monopoly—to make them practically Free to actual settlers, otherwise landless, . . . is the duty of Congress, but there are still duties devolving upon *you*. . . . The Convention can forbid future aggregations of great Landed Estates. . . by breaking up of those which now exist in our State."³³ He also asserted: "Our plan would save our city a good part of the heavy expense of Pauperism. . . . Who ever heard of a farmer starving on his land?" The *Philadelphia Public Ledger* and the *New York Globe* answered Greeley in threatening tones; the latter, although admitting the frightful nature of poverty in New York City, stated that it could have no sympathy with the idea of land for

²⁹ *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1846; *New York Daily Tribune*, Jan. 23, 1846.

³⁰ From the *New York Courier and Express*, quoted in the *New York Weekly Tribune*, Jan. 31, 1846.

³¹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 14, 1846.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*, July 4, 1846.

the landless.³⁴ The *Express* asserted that it had knocked Fourierism out of the *Tribune* and that very shortly it would knock Land Reform out of it.³⁵

Regardless of the severe indictment which Greeley received at the hands of the opposition press, no editor was to be successful in forcing Land Reform out of the *Tribune*. Greeley's agrarian crusade bode ill for the conservative interests of the East and created dissension within the Whig Party.³⁶ As a party it appealed to the laboring classes, but did little for them. Thurlow Weed was delighted to get the support of the *Tribune*, but deplored Greeley's adventure on the land question. In 1847, the *New York Courier and Express* attempted to read Greeley out of the party.³⁷ Judged from its beginning, it looked as though Land Reform might very shortly become a national political issue. Such would have been its destiny had the issue not been engulfed in the slavery controversy, appearing daily amidst the politics connected with the Mexican War.

Greeley watched the progress of the homestead bill introduced in Congress by Representative Herrick of New York on March 9, 1846. This bill was backed by the National Reform Association. The House of Representatives refused to print it. On the same day, Andrew Johnson of Tennessee introduced his bill on this subject. Greeley reprimanded the House for refusing to print Herrick's bill and at the same time allowing the introduction of Johnson's. As for the latter, Greeley claimed that its idea was borrowed from the Land Reformers. While he was glad to see the principle perpetuated, yet he felt that Johnson's bill was not "speculative proof."³⁸

Throughout 1847 Greeley's interest in Land Reform was constant. He pointed to Britain with its unemployment problem and the famine in Ireland. He elaborated Lord John Russell's

³⁴ Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, July 11, 1846; *New York Globe*, July 11, 1846.

³⁵ Quoted from the *Courier and Express* in the *New York Weekly Tribune*, July 11, 1846.

³⁶ *New York Weekly Tribune*, Dec. 2, 1846.

³⁷ *New York Courier and Express*, Aug. 14, 1847.

³⁸ *New York Weekly Tribune*, April 18, 1846.

proposal of devoting one million pounds sterling to the improvement of nearly five million acres of waste land in Ireland. He lauded Roebuck, a leading Liberal of the House, who had exclaimed, "Sir, I say that it is the duty of England . . . to *insist that the Land* shall maintain the People of Ireland." And in biting sarcasm he concluded his discussion: "Where are the *Courier and Enquirers* and *Expresses* of Great Britain?"³⁹

In the light of Greeley's interest in Land Reform it is not difficult to understand his unbounded sympathy for the Irish. The opposition to his Irish program was considerable in New York and elsewhere, but he put his humanitarian crusade on a worldwide basis when he averred: "Put it in the strongest, most offensive light, and it affirms that the Right of the Human Race to live is older, stronger, more sacred, than the right of any individual to retain uncultivated or to exact his own price for liberty to cultivate a whole County or Province of God's earth."⁴⁰ The Irish should be welcomed, for they will "bring and create wealth to an indefinite extent. The untilled lands of the great West, that require but moderate attention to be abundantly productive, can receive, occupy and reward a nation of industrious laborers. . . . Judging of the Future by the Past, the completion of this Century will exhibit a mighty empire resting upon the Great Lakes and the Northern Mississippi."⁴¹

After this spirited fight, Greeley took a trip into the Northwest, the first west of the Alleghenies since 1831. He showed considerable interest in the development of the copper mines in the Superior region.⁴² In Illinois he deplored the amount of vacant land held for speculation. His sincere belief in the imminent greatness of the West caused him to predict that by 1900 Chicago would surpass New York City in population.⁴³ His proposal of a Pacific railroad is further evidence of his interest.⁴⁴ Wisconsin received much praise for adopting the principle of homestead-exemption.⁴⁵

³⁹ *Ibid.*, March 6, 1847.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, April 24, 1847.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*, July 17, 1847.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, July 31, 1847.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, June 26, Sept. 8, 1847.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, Sept. 11, 1847.

With considerable pride Greeley surveyed the growth of Land Reform: "None who have not taken a decided interest in the subject can realize the rapidity with which the idea of a Reform in the Laws governing the acquisition and disposition of Land is spreading and finding favor in this country. Hardly two years have passed since it first attracted any share of public regard, yet at this moment we think not less than fifty periodicals earnestly advocate it."⁴⁶

Attention now began to center around the campaign and election of 1848. In 1847, the Industrial Congress, in its second session, agreed to support the Liberty Party if it selected a candidate favoring Land Reform.⁴⁷ Greeley, in October, 1847, expressed hope that the Whig Party would adopt measures pertaining to the improvement of social relations, especially Land Reform.⁴⁸ With little hope of their doing so, he continued his flirtations with the Liberty Party, which was headed by Gerrit Smith and was already displaying Land Reform on its banners. At the same time he urged the Free-Soilers to "secure to each and all . . . a really Free Soil!—especially free from the hated speculators."⁴⁹

At the beginning of 1848 Greeley again denounced Congress for its failure to take up Land Reform. "Wages in many sections are falling while rents and food grow dearer, and employment becomes more and more scanty and precarious."⁵⁰ He hailed with delight the convention of National Reformers, meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 17, declaring that "these are among the first mutterings of a gathering tempest."⁵¹ The Industrial Congress in its third annual meeting at Philadelphia nominated Gerrit Smith of New York for president and William S. Wait of Illinois

⁴⁶ Among these journals Greeley named the *Herald of Truth* (Cincinnati); *Young America* (New York City); *Spirit of Freedom* (Cleveland); *Homestead Journal* (Salem, Ohio); the *Albany Freeholder*; and *National Reformer* (Rochester). See *New York Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 9, 1847. Greeley forgot to mention any of the German newspapers, such as the *Volk's Tribune*.

⁴⁷ *New York Weekly Tribune*, June 12, 1847.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, Oct. 2, 1847.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, Nov. 20, 1847.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, April 1, 1848.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, June 3, 1848.

for vice-president, putting forward "Land Reform" as their main plank.⁵² The Land Reform movement was rapidly spreading westward to the region where it would naturally find ready support.

The force of slavery and the expansionist issue kept Land Reform from the limelight in 1848. Greeley caused much disruption in the Whig ranks by his refusal to support General Taylor, the Whig nominee; at the same time he bitterly attacked General Cass, the Democratic candidate, for his extensive speculation in western lands.⁵³ Cass had just repudiated free soil. Taylor was an expansionist, and the Mexican War had resulted in the addition of territory which might prove suitable to the slavery-extension interests. Greeley desired the West to remain open to free institutions.

Probably Greeley would have supported any party in 1848 which openly favored Land Reform. When the Free-Soil Party met in convention at Buffalo in July, there was much hope among the Land Reformers that it would adopt the principle of free land as well as free soil. It nominated Martin Van Buren for president, but hedged on the issue of free land.⁵⁴ Greeley, at first, did not feel that the Free-Soil platform was ambiguous. He wrote to Schuyler Colfax, "If I could make Van Buren president tomorrow, I would. . . . I do like the principles he now embodies—Free Soil and Land Reform. . . . The Free Soil party is the only live party around us."⁵⁵ But the Free-Soilers "missed a great opportunity of drawing in a large Western vote by not featuring the homestead issue."⁵⁶ In the East, besides the *Tribune*, the principle had the open support of the New York *Globe* and the Philadelphia *Daily Sun*. With only Gerrit Smith's party having embraced Land Reform, the campaign was not too far gone to win Greeley back to the Whig fold. The Whigs sorely needed his support; Thurlow Weed placed Greeley's name on the New York ticket as

⁵² *Ibid.*, July 1, 1848.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, Aug. 5, 1848.

⁵⁴ George M. Stephenson, *The Political History of the Public Lands, from 1840 to 1862*, 136 (Boston, 1917).

⁵⁵ Quoted in Constance M. Rourke, *Trumpets of Jubilee*, 298 (New York, 1927).

⁵⁶ Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 138.

a candidate for Congress to fill an unexpired term, and the *Tribune* returned to the support of Taylor and the Whigs.

With the Whig victory, Greeley became a member of the short session of Congress opening in December, 1848. On the second day of the session he gave notice that he would introduce a home-stead bill. This he did on December 13, but it was not again referred to until February 27 when the committee asked to be released from further consideration of the subject.⁵⁷ A western member of the House wanted to know why a New Yorker should busy himself with the disposition of the public domain. Greeley replied that "he represented more landless men than any other member" on the floor of Congress.⁵⁸ The bill was tabled, only twenty members seeming to favor it,⁵⁹ and thus ended Greeley's attempt to convert Congress to Land Reform. Neither party wanted to sponsor a measure so akin to the dangerous slavery issue. With the conservatives of both parties in control, there was little hope for Land Reform.

Notwithstanding, economic forces were rapidly moulding a situation that would make for the fruition of the Land Reform movement. The influx of immigrants from Ireland and Germany afforded a supply of labor which could not be drained off by the West. An oceanic transportation system was being developed which would aid in the maintenance of the labor reserve in the East. The growth of the factory system called for wide markets. Farms carved from the forests and prairies would supply this need. The development of canals and railroads was creating an East and West economic alliance. Never before were prospects brighter for the realization of Clay's American System which Greeley advocated daily in the columns of the *Tribune*. If the Whigs were to sponsor this new economic order, then it was necessary that they discard their old scruples on western agrarianism and admit the principle of free land. This gradual shifting of the economic center of gravity was soon to cause many manufacturers and employers to align themselves with the Land Reformers.

⁵⁷ *Congressional Globe*, 30 Congress, 2 Session, p. 13 and 605.

⁵⁸ Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 217.

⁵⁹ *The Whig Almanac*, 37-38 (New York, 1850).

Greeley was not slow in sensing these economic tendencies. In the 1840's he had emphasized the advantages of free land to the working classes; in the 1850's his philosophy of the soil broadened, and included a direct appeal to the manufacturers and employers of the East. This new turn in the crusade for free land was clearly evident in the columns of the *Daily Tribune*, its main circulation being in the population centers of the East.⁶⁰

"Every smoke that rises in [the] Great West marks a new customer to the counting rooms and ware-houses of New York," declared Greeley.⁶¹ Fewer paupers and fewer tenants would mean more produce, more markets, and consequently more wealth.⁶² "Every thousand hardy, efficient workers who float West on Free Lands would leave places open for as many others; and these taking a step upward, would leave room for advancement of as many more and so on. Even to those workers who will never migrate, Free Land at the West would be a great and lasting benefit."⁶³ And lastly, he avowed, "It [free land] will enable us to appeal forcibly to the settler of the New States for Protection to the exposed Industry of their Atlantic brethren by whom they have been dealt with generously."⁶⁴

Greeley's appeal also became broader in its humanitarian aspects. The soil, he declared, was God's gift to man. Frequent references were made to the laws promulgated by Moses.⁶⁵ At

⁶⁰ In 1845 it was estimated that there were two thousand newspapers published in the United States, and that six hundred of these supported Land Reform in 1850. See Selig Perlman, *A History of Trade Unionism in the United States*, 38 (New York, 1922). In one year, 1852-53, the circulation of the *New York Daily Tribune* increased from 17,640 to 26,880; the *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, from 3,120 to 11,400; and the *Weekly Tribune*, which circulated mostly in the mid-west, from 51,000 to 103,680. By 1854 Greeley's *Tribune* wielded more influence in America than any other newspaper. See Willard G. Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*, 228 (New York, 1927). Bayard Taylor wrote that it came next to the Bible throughout the West. See James Ford Rhodes, *Lectures on the Civil War*, 30 (New York, 1913). The *Tribune* grew in circulation and influence until in 1860 the *Weekly Tribune* reached the almost incredible figure of 217,000.

⁶¹ *New York Daily Tribune*, March 9, 1849.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*, May 6, 1852.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, Dec. 28, 1849.

one time he quoted from *Leviticus* 25:23, "The land shall not be sold forever; for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me."⁶⁶ From this quotation he deduced that to sell land as "mere merchandise, like molasses or mackerel" was a sin.⁶⁷ Later he asserted that "Every bird, every beast has a home, which he inhabits and enjoys without apprehension of ejection or deprivation, at least by his own species. Man alone erects houses for others to inhabit and enjoy. And is the time not at hand when every free citizen shall have his own home if he will?"⁶⁸

The first and second editions of his book, *Hints Toward Reforms*, appearing in 1851 and 1853, respectively, included important essays on "The Right to Labor," "Land Reform," and "Coming to the City." His deep agrarian sympathy is asserted in the following statement: "The defeasance or confiscation of Man's natural right to use any portion of the Earth's surface not actually in use by another is an important fact, to be kept in view in every consideration of the duty of the affluent and comfortable to the poor and unfortunate."⁶⁹ "What Nature indicates and Justice requires is *Equal Opportunities* to All."⁷⁰ "National Reform is the broad and sure basis whereon all other Reforms may be safely erected. . . . It would hardly be possible to exaggerate the ultimate benefits of the proposed Reform, and the day of its triumph should be hailed by the poor and lowly as the birthday of their independence, as the Fourth of July is celebrated as that of the Nation."⁷¹

In 1850, Daniel Webster introduced a resolution in the Senate on free land which attracted considerable attention.⁷² It conformed quite closely to the bills put forward by the Land Reformers.⁷³ In the same session of Congress, William H. Seward

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, March 9, 1849.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, May 6, 1852.

⁶⁹ Horace Greeley, *Hints Toward Reforms*, 318 (New York, 1853).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 315.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 317.

⁷² *Congressional Globe*, 31 Congress, 1 Session, p. 616.

⁷³ Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 142; *Senate Miscellaneous Document 32*, 31 Congress, 1 Session.

of New York introduced his bill providing for free land.⁷⁴ Slowly, the northern Whig leaders were attracted to the ideals of the Land Reformers.

The Democratic Party, on the other hand, was confused on the land question. Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri had inaugurated the fight for free land in the early 1820's, and the West was almost completely won over to homesteading by 1852.⁷⁵ Conspicuous in the organization of the movement in the Northwest was the National Reform Association of Chicago.⁷⁶ By 1850, such progressive Democratic leaders as Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois, and Sam Houston of Texas, had taken up the cause and were embarrassing the conservative slavery interests of the Old South, who already realized that free land meant free soil.⁷⁷ More dissension was added to the ranks of the party in 1852 when a leading representative of northern Democracy, Galusha A. Grow, from David Wilmot's district in Pennsylvania, considering himself the true inheritor of Benton's views, entered the crusade for Land Reform in the interests of the laboring classes.⁷⁸

So far as the politics of the years 1849 to 1854 was concerned, Greeley's columns of the *Tribune* were alive with editorials, letters, and comments relating to the progress of Land Reform. He was highly pleased when such Whig leaders as Seward and

⁷⁴ *Congressional Globe*, 31 Congress, 1 Session, p. 263.

⁷⁵ Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 165.

⁷⁶ Arthur C. Cole, *The Era of the Civil War, 1848-1870*, 91 (Springfield, Ill., 1919).

⁷⁷ Andrew Johnson was the leading advocate of the principle in Congress. His first bill was introduced in 1846. See *supra*, p. 27. For Douglas' bill, see *Congressional Globe*, 31 Congress, 1 Session, p. 87. For Houston's bill, see *ibid.*, 262.

⁷⁸ See his speech of March 30, 1852 in the *Appendix to the Congressional Globe*, 32 Congress, 1 Session, p. 426-427. Grow's speeches contain many expressions that are the replica of those of the Land Reformers. Inasmuch as he was a close observer of the columns of the *Tribune*, having taken that newspaper since its first issue, one may conclude that Greeley, as well as Benton, had considerable influence upon Grow. See James T. Du Bois and Gertrude S. Mathews, *Galusha A. Grow, Father of the Homestead Law*, 288 (New York, 1917). Professor Commons declared that Grow's speeches were "merely an oratorical transcript" from the *Working Man's Advocate*; see John R. Commons, "Horace Greeley and the Working Class Origins of the Republican Party," *Political Science Quarterly*, 24:484 (September, 1909).

Webster took up the issue. He carefully reported the details of the Sixth Industrial Congress in the *Tribune*, for Seward and he had been earnestly considered by these Industrialists as possible candidates for president of the United States, and were only passed over at the last moment in favor of Isaac Walker of Wisconsin.⁷⁹ Of the homestead bills in Congress in 1851-52, Greeley had been most vehement in support of Walker's bill, and when it went down to defeat early in 1852, he sarcastically remarked that "Land Reform was slapped in the face on Wednesday by that illustrious body, the United States Senate."⁸⁰ Finally, in May of the same year, the House passed its first homestead bill, and Greeley joyfully proclaimed, "Free Homes for the Homeless is thus affirmed as American principle and American policy. May it never be departed from! That one vote [107 to 56] is worth more to our country and to Mankind than all Congress has done for the last half-dozen years."⁸¹ Congress had been so zealous in granting land bounties to soldiers and railroads,—measures for the speculator,— "now," asked Greeley, "why can't it grant the poor man a break?"⁸²

There was considerable doubt in Greeley's mind that Land Reform could be made an issue in the campaign and election of 1852. The old parties "are exceedingly shy of the new questions which come up to divide the country," he charged; "For the moment at least, compact and thoroughgoing parties exist only with reference to a few questions of long standing. . . What chance is there of the Northern party, of which we have heard and spoken in times past?"⁸³ He seemed to agree with the stand taken by the *Albany State Register* that "The Whig party needs purification."⁸⁴ He was more than lukewarm in support of Webster for president, but he doubted that his connection with the Fugitive Slave Law would make him a desirable candidate.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ *New York Weekly Tribune*, June 14, 1851.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, Jan. 24, 1852.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, May 15, 1852.

⁸² *Ibid.*, May 22, 1852.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, June 14, 1851.

⁸⁴ Quoted in *ibid.*, June 12, 1852.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, March 20, 1852.

General Winfield Scott, in a letter accepting his nomination by the Whigs, stated that he favored settlement of the public domain by actual occupants *only*.⁸⁶ But this was only a "hedge" on the issue. The Democrats made a worse muddle, and Greeley bitterly took both parties to task for dodging Land Reform.⁸⁷ With the overwhelming Democratic victory, the homestead issue received a setback. The Democratic Party was daily becoming more and more embarrassed by the Land Reform movement.

With the election of Pierce, Greeley's hopes seemed shattered. At times he declared he was through with politics. He became more and more dissatisfied with the Whig Party and talked earnestly in favor of a Northern party. Because of this frame of mind, the rise of the Kansas-Nebraska question started him on a new course. Before 1853, he had been an antislavery advocate in the interest of humanitarianism, but in the Kansas-Nebraska measure of 1854 he saw both his humanitarian and economic principles thwarted. To Douglas's endeavor, Greeley curtly replied, "If Slavery is determined upon the conquest of free territory it will inevitably be resisted and paid in kind. . . . Let but the sentiment gain foothold that Slavery intends to make war upon the territory of freedom, and seize and appropriate whatever it can wrest from the hands of free labor, and the banner of reclamation will be raised."⁸⁸ If slavery were allowed to enter the great Northwest, then every true Northerner would declare that "You have smitten the land with a curse which averts immigration, and prevents it from bearing its due part in the industry of civilization. You have spoiled an immense future market for the future product of our northwestern hive."⁸⁹

The hard times of 1854 caused Greeley to become more bitter with everything and everyone. When hundreds of willing mechanics and laborers asked what they were to do, the editor of the *Tribune* answered them "in a lump:" "Go straight into the country—go at once!"⁹⁰ "Make the lands free tomorrow," he

⁸⁶ Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 146.

⁸⁷ *New York Weekly Tribune*, June 12, 1852.

⁸⁸ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, Jan. 13, 1854.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 17, 1854.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, July 3, 1854.

declared, "and millions of acres would be rapidly claimed and settled by men now loitering about our towns and villages."⁹¹ Although one might expect him to have been jubilant over the passage of a homestead bill in the House on March 6, he was discouraged, for, as he said, the real danger was not in the House but in the Senate. "A body that would pass so atrocious an act as the Nebraska iniquity will not be likely to follow it by one so beneficent."⁹² When the Senate passed the Graduation Act, which he termed a "speculator's boon," and defeated the homestead bill, he remarked "That the wisest and most beneficent idea of our age . . . should be rejected and defeated by the present Senate can surprise no one . . . it is perfectly well understood that the slave-breeding states cherish a special and intense hatred of this measure."⁹³

To arrest the spread of slavery into the territories, a new party arose to take the place of the old Whig Party, and in its organization Greeley played a prominent part.⁹⁴ While his main interest now centered in the antislavery crusade, he still found time to continue his prosecution of Land Reform, although such a measure could not be adopted immediately by the Republican Party. While on the platform committee of the Republican state convention at Syracuse in 1855, he had submitted a resolution demanding free land.⁹⁵ Many labor organizations had joined the Republican Party, and they demanded free land second only to free soil.⁹⁶ But homesteading could not be made an issue in 1856 as the Republican Party had all it could do to keep its various elements united on the plank of free soil.

The Panic of 1857 brought more suffering to the redundant

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, July 21, 1854.

⁹² *New York Weekly Tribune*, March 7, 1854.

⁹³ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, July 21, 1854.

⁹⁴ Professor Commons states that in the rise of the Republican Party "the greatest single factor was Horace Greeley and the *New York Tribune*." See, "Horace Greeley and the Working Class Origins of the Republican Party," *op. cit.*, 488. At Ripon, Wisconsin, in 1854, Alvan E. Bovay, formerly associated with Evans and the Land Reformers of New York City, manipulated the first political organization to protest the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. See *ibid.*, 484.

⁹⁵ *New York Weekly Tribune*, Oct. 6, 1855.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, Oct. 11, 1856.

thousands in the eastern cities. Western farmers were as hard pressed as the eastern laborers.⁹⁷ Not until 1858 did the land question again become prominent in Congress. As Greeley justly claimed at the time, the action on the principle had been postponed "by the votes of those who supported the Lecompton and English bills."⁹⁸ But "besides this 'peculiar interest'," he observed, "there is the great Railroad Land-Grant interest, which supposes it would be sadly damaged. . . . The Bounty Land warrant interest cannot be easily reconciled. . . . But, gentlemen speculators! you have had a long day and a merry one! . . . Your sun has shone and you have made your hay; now stand back and give the settlers a chance."⁹⁹

Andrew Johnson and Galusha Grow received considerable attention in the columns of the *Tribune* as they marshalled the free-land forces in Congress.¹⁰⁰ After looking over the legislation of the Thirty-fifth Congress, Greeley claimed that tribute was due to two champions above all others, namely, Benjamin Wade of Ohio and Galusha Grow of Pennsylvania. On February 25, 1859, Wade had summarized the slavery-homestead crisis as the question of whether "we give niggers to the niggerless, or land to the landless."¹⁰¹ At a Republican meeting in Toledo on April 21, 1860, Wade was hailed as the father of homesteading.¹⁰² "The rights of Free Labor," declared Greeley, "have seldom had a more clear-sighted and effective champion in Congress than old Ben Wade. . . . And Mr. Grow, whom we have seldom praised, and never greatly admired, has this Session evinced a fertility of resource . . . such as has rarely been exhibited on that floor. The passage of the homestead bill under Mr. Grow's leadership would of itself have suffered to confer honorable distinction."¹⁰³

⁹⁷ *New York Daily Tribune*, Dec. 25, 1858.

⁹⁸ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, May 18, 1858.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 9, 1859.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, May 21, 1858, Feb. 9, 1859.

¹⁰¹ *Congressional Globe*, 35 Congress, 2 Session, p. 1354.

¹⁰² *New York Weekly Tribune*, May 21, 1860. The same title was claimed by Andrew Johnson in 1858. See Robert W. Winston, *Andrew Johnson: Plebeian and Patriot*, 139 (New York, 1928).

¹⁰³ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, May 8, 1859.

When the Homestead Bill reached the Senate Greeley was relentless in his efforts to persuade its passage by that body. "Why should the Senate hold back? Twice ere this had the House voted that every landless American citizen should be authorized to choose a patch of the Public Domain. . . . The Senate has repeatedly debated it. No Committee could shed fresh light upon it. Conscript Fathers! spare us your eloquence and give us the Yea's and Nay's! . . . The passage of the Free Homestead Bill will be a new Declaration of Independence—the Emancipation of the industrious poverty. It would be fitly commemorated through future years."¹⁰⁴ He warned the Democrats: "Can you afford to throw the question over into the next Presidential Election?"¹⁰⁵ He then printed the names of the Senators from the free states who opposed the principle, and demanded that they get in line. As the time for the vote approached he expressed doubt that the bill would pass and prophesied that if it did President Buchanan would veto it.¹⁰⁶

The Homestead Bill was destined to go through another stage of hectic wrangling, in which Grow and Johnson played the conspicuous parts. On March 8, 1860, before the Republican Party had held its convention, Greeley published in pamphlet form Grow's speech made in the House on February 29, 1860, claiming it to be "an advocacy of the Republican policy of granting the Public Lands in limited tracts to actual settlers for the bare cost of survey and sale."¹⁰⁷ The Homestead Bill passed the House on March 12, and as it went to the Senate, Greeley again urged that the policy of evasion should not be continued. To the Democrats he hurled the biting statement: "Credible rumors import that Mr. Buchanan's Southern masters have pledged him to veto it. . . . And if it shall be again throttled whether by President or Senate, we shall be consoled by the hope that his act will go far to insure the triumph of the friends of Free Homesteads

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, Feb. 9, 1859.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, Feb. 22, 1859.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, March 4, 1859.

¹⁰⁷ *New York Daily Tribune*, March 8, 1860. This speech was later included in the *Political Textbook for 1860* (New York, 1860), prepared by Greeley and John F. Cleveland; see p. 182-193.

1859.
Homestead
Bill of 1860
vetoed by
Buchanan

in the approaching Presidential election."¹⁰⁸ Although Greeley did not like the provisions of the compromise bill passed by the Senate, he stated that it was better to take "a half-loaf" than no bread at all.¹⁰⁹

The veto of President Buchanan on June 22, which could not be overridden, brought forth columns of wrath in the *Tribune*. After printing the bill in full and refuting every sentence of the veto message, Greeley concluded, "Such a veto as this of Buchanan's is one of the natural consequences of elevating to the Presidency a man who from past associations has no sympathy with the poor, and who regards only the interests of speculators. Does anybody suppose that Abraham Lincoln would ever veto such a bill?"¹¹⁰

The pressure of the slavery issue in 1860 caused the Republican Party to seek a compromise candidate from the West. The manner in which the platform of the Chicago convention was drawn indicates that the Northwest was considered the key to the election.¹¹¹ Greeley, serving as a delegate from Oregon, arrived in Chicago several days before the convention opened.¹¹² In January, after viewing the political possibilities in the Northwest, he had written from Davenport that no Democrat other than Douglas or Johnson, the latter an active proponent of the homesteading principle, could hope for success against the rising Republicanism.¹¹³ As a member of the platform committee, Greeley probably wrote the homestead plank.¹¹⁴ It is hardly an over-

¹⁰⁸ *New York Daily Tribune*, March 19, 1860.

¹⁰⁹ *New York Weekly Tribune*, June 23, 1860.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, June 30, 1860.

¹¹¹ William E. Dodd, "The Fight for the Northwest, 1860," *American Historical Review*, 16:774-788 (July, 1911). Professor Dodd feels that the homestead issue greatly influenced the vote in Illinois and perhaps the rest of the Northwest; see *ibid.*, 787.

¹¹² Parton, *op. cit.*, 445.

¹¹³ *Dubuque Herald*, Sept. 26, 1860, quoted in Stephenson, *op. cit.*, 234. The support of the homesteading principle by the German and Scandinavian element should not be overlooked; see, Emerson D. Fite, *The Presidential Campaign of 1860*, 250, 262 (New York, 1911).

¹¹⁴ Greeley spent much time in an effort to bring the doubtful states in line with the principles of the platform. See, Fite, *op. cit.*, 126.

statement to say that all the new planks of the Republican platform were not so much the result of antislavery as of the growing industrial needs.¹¹⁵

Abraham Lincoln was elected president, but his victory did not secure the immediate enactment of the Republican platform. Only after the Southern states seceded was there a majority in both houses favorable to the program. Greeley, observing an attitude of watchful waiting, refused to allow the issues to rest. Early in 1862, he reminded Congress that the Chicago platform of 1860 was still up-to-date and that it was not an old-fashioned document.¹¹⁶ And still he advised the redundant thousands in the eastern cities: "Young men! Poor men! Widows! resolve to have a home of your own! If you are able to buy and pay for one in the East, very well; if not, make one in the broad and fertile West!"¹¹⁷ Go West, young man, go forth into the country!

When the Homestead Bill finally passed the Senate on May 6, 1862, Greeley, knowing that its progress henceforth would not be impeded, burst forth in the columns of his *Tribune* with unbounded praise: "We may congratulate the country on the consummation of one of the most beneficent and vital reforms ever attempted in any age or clime—a reform calculated to diminish sensibly the number of paupers and idlers and increase the proportion of working, independent, self-subsisting farmers in the land evermore. Its blessings will be felt more and more . . . widely for the next twenty years. . . . The clouds that have darkened our National prospects are breaking away, and the sunshine of Peace, Prosperity and Progress, will ere long irradiate the land. Let us rejoice in and gather strength from the prospect."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, xiii.

¹¹⁶ *New York Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1862.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, June 6, 1862.

¹¹⁸ *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, May 9, 1862. The Homestead Act was printed in full in the issue of May 23. Act of May 20, 1862, *Statutes at Large*, 12: 392.

NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

DECEMBER MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

The Agricultural History Society met with the American Historical Association and other historical societies at Toronto, Canada, on December 27-29, 1932. The joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association on Wednesday morning, December 28, was devoted to a paper by Professor Fred Landon of the University of Western Ontario on "The Effect of the Civil War in the United States upon Canadian Agriculture" and the paper by Professor V. Alton Moody on "Agrarian Reform before Post-War European Constituent Assemblies," to be printed in the April number. The discussion of the papers was lively and profitable. Professor Frederick Merk of Harvard University presided. On Wednesday evening, the Agricultural History Society met with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at a joint dinner. On behalf of the Society, Professor L. B. Schmidt gave an address on "The Prairies and Plains in Our Times." The Society's president, Professor Ulrich B. Phillips, scheduled to speak for the Association, was unable to attend, but his paper on "The Traits and Contributions of F. J. Turner" was read.

ATLAS OF HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

The Carnegie Institution of Washington and the American Geographical Society of New York have recently published an *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States*, which embodies the results of twenty years of original research. In its preparation Dr. Charles O. Paullin, the author, and Dr. John K. Wright, the editor, had the collaboration of the foremost specialists in American history and geography. The atlas contains about 620 maps grouped under such broad topics as natural environment, cartography, Indians, explorations, lands, settlement,

population, cultural and religious development, boundaries, political parties and opinion, reforms, industries and transportation, commerce, wealth, and military history. There are sixty-two maps on the development of American agriculture. The atlas is described by Dr. John K. Wright in an article entitled "Sections and National Growth; An Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States," in the *Geogr. Rev.*, 22:353-360 (July, 1932).

ARTICLES ON AGRICULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES

Among the recent articles of interest to readers of AGRICULTURAL HISTORY are the following: (general or comprehensive): Everett E. Edwards, "An Annotated Bibliography on the Materials, the Scope, and the Significance of American Agricultural History," *Agr. Hist.*, 6:38-43 (January, 1932); Joseph Schafer, "Some Enduring Factors in Rural Polity," *ibid.*, 6:161-180 (October, 1932); Frederic L. Paxson, "The Agricultural Surplus: A Problem in History," *ibid.*, 6:51-68 (April, 1932); Purdue Univ. Dept. Agr. Extension, *The Story of Wheat* (Lafayette, Ind., 1931. 69 p., illus.); Holbrook Working, "Cycles in Wheat Prices," Stanford Univ., Food Research Inst., *Wheat Studies*, 8 (1): 1-66 (November, 1931); Louis A. Fisher, "Shifts in the Location of the Flour Milling Industry," *Minn. Business Rev.*, December, 1931; "Discussion of Old Flour Mills," in *Indiana, Ind. Hist. Bul.*, 9:179 (February, 1932); Helen M. Strong, "Export Wheat Producing Regions," *Econ. Geogr.*, 8:161-190 (April, 1932); Harrison John Thornton, "Oats in History," *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Politics*, 30:377-394 (July, 1932), affording a valuable survey of the westward movement of the cultivation of oats, especially in the United States; T. Ralph Robinson, "A Fifty Million Dollar Orange from Brazil and Other Gifts of the Americas to the Citrus Fruit Industry," *Bul. Pan Amer. Union*, 65:1145-1150 (November, 1931), pertaining especially to the grapefruit and the navel orange; William G. Reed, "Competing Cottons and United States Production," *Econ. Geogr.*, 8:282-298 (July, 1932); Garnet W. Forster, "The Effects of the Present Credit System on Southern Agriculture," *Social Forces*, 10:426-435 (March, 1932); "An Early Chapter in the American Sheep In-

dustry," *Business Hist. Soc. Bul.*, 6 (5):1-6 (November, 1932); R. O. Bausman, "Farm Tenancy in Delaware," *Del. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 178, 123 p. (Newark, 1932), including considerable historical material on the subject; O. M. Johnson, "Changes in Farm Tenancy during Fifty Years," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, 14:685-687 (October, 1932); R. L. Ellsworth, and others, "Statistics of Farmers' Selling and Buying Associations, United States, 1863-1931," *Fed. Farm Bd. Bul.* 9, 91 p. (Washington, D. C., June, 1932); James C. Malin, "The Background of the First Bills to Establish a Bureau of Markets," *Agr. Hist.*, 6:107-129 (July, 1932); Howard R. Tolley, "The History and Objectives of Outlook Work," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, 13:523-534 (October, 1931); C. B. Smith, "The Origin of Farm Economics Extension," *ibid.*, 14:17-22 (January, 1932), and G. F. Warren, "The Origin and Development of Farm Economics in the United States," *ibid.*, 14:2-9 (January, 1932); E. H. Thomson, "The Origin and Development of Farm Management in the U. S. Department of Agriculture," *ibid.*, 14:10-16 (January, 1932); Josiah C. Folsom, "Farm Labour Research in the United States," *Internatl. Labour Rev.*, 25:646-665 (May, 1932); "The Fiftieth Anniversary of the State Experiment Stations in New York, Ohio, and Massachusetts," and "New Jersey's Agricultural Experiment Station, 1880-1930," editorials in the *Expt. Sta. Rec.*, 66:701-706 (June, 1932); James C. Malin, "Notes on the Literature of Populism," *Kans. Hist. Quart.*, 1:160-164 (February, 1932); Thomas A. Bailey, "The West and Radical Legislation, 1890-1930," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, 38:603-611 (January, 1933); J. Sullivan Gibson, "Agriculture of the Southern High Plains," *Econ. Geogr.*, 8:245-261 (July, 1932).

Arizona: C. Daryll Forde, "Hopi Agriculture and Land Ownership," *Royal Anthropol. Inst. of Great Britain and Ireland Jour.*, 61:357-606 (July-December, 1931); Omar A. Turney, "Prehistoric Irrigation," in the Salt River Valley, *Ariz. Hist. Rev.*, 2 (1):12-52, (2):11-52, (3):9-45, (4):33-73 (1929-1930); J. C. McGregor, "Prehistoric Cotton Fabrics of Arizona," *Museum Notes* (Flagstaff), 4 (2), 4 p. (August, 1931); Katherine Bartlett, "Prehistoric Pueblo Foods," *ibid.*, 4 (4), 4 p. (October, 1931).

California: R. H. Allen, "The Influence of Spanish and Mexi-

can Land Grants on California Agriculture," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, 14:679-680 (October, 1932); H. F. Raup, "Land Use and Water Supply Problems in Southern California: The Case of the Perris Valley," *Geogr. Rev.*, 22:270-278 (April, 1932); Clifford M. Zierer, "Migratory Beekeepers in Southern California," *ibid.*, 22:260-269 (April, 1932), his "The Lima Bean Industry of the Southern California Coastal Region," *Bul. Geogr. Soc. Philadelphia*, 27:65-86 (1929), and his "The Ventura Area of Southern California," *ibid.*, 30:26-58 (January, 1932); John Wesley Coulter, "Lucia: An Isolated Mountain District in California," *ibid.*, 29:183-198 (July, 1931); L. D. Mallory, S. R. Smith, and S. W. Shear, "Factors Affecting Annual Prices of California Fresh Grapes, 1921-1929," *Hilgardia*, 6:101-130 (September, 1931); S. W. Shear and R. M. Howe, "Factors Affecting California Raisin Sales and Prices, 1922-1929," *ibid.*, 6:73-100 (September, 1931); Thomas A. Bailey, "California, Japan, and the Alien Land Legislation of 1913," *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, 1:36-59 (March, 1932).

Carolinas: Ina C. Yoakley, "Wild Plant Industry of the Southern Appalachians," *Econ. Geogr.*, 8:311-317 (July, 1932); James B. Browning, "The North Carolina Black Code," *Jour. Negro Hist.*, 15:461-473 (October, 1930); George Rogers Taylor, "Wholesale Commodity Prices in Charleston, South Carolina, 1796-1861," *Jour. Econ. and Business Hist.*, 4:848-868 (August, 1932).

Colorado: Leon W. Fuller, "A Populist Newspaper of the Nineties; The Aspen Union Era," *Colo. Mag.*, 9:81-87 (May, 1932); McFall Kerbey, "Colorado, A Barrier that Became a Goal," *Natl. Geogr. Mag.*, 62:1-63 (July, 1932).

Florida: Wilber H. Seibert, "Slavery in East Florida, 1776-1785," *Fla. Hist. Soc. Quart.*, 10:139-161 (January, 1932); Kathryn T. Abbey, "The Story of the Lafayette Lands in Florida," *ibid.*, January, 1932; Paul D. Camp, "A Study of Range Cattle Management in Alachua County, Florida," *Fla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 248 (June, 1932); W. T. Hicks, "The Development of the Tung Oil Industry in Florida," *Jour. Geogr.*, 31:27-35 (January, 1932); Jean Dufrénoy, "L'Evolution Agricole de la Floride," *Agriculture Pratique des Pays Chauds* (13):520-526 (July, 1931);

Annie Francé-Harrar, "Florida, das Land des Überflusses," *Erd-ball*, 5:214-217, 271-275 (1931); John L. Wann, "Where Florida Truck Crops are Grown," *Econ. Geogr.*, 9:85-103 (January, 1933).

Georgia: Ralph B. Flanders, "The Free Negro in Ante-Bellum Georgia," *N. C. Hist. Rev.*, 9:250-272 (July, 1932), and his "Planters' Problems in Ante-Bellum Georgia," *Ga. Hist. Quart.*, March, 1930; H. B. Fant, "The Labor Policy of the Trustees for Establishing the Colony of Georgia in America," *ibid.*, March, 1932; David M. Potter, Jr., "The Rise of the Plantation System in Georgia," during the colonial period, *ibid.*, 16:114-135 (June, 1932).

Hawaii: John Wesley Coulter, "The Island of Hawaii," *Jour. Geogr.*, 31:225-236 (September, 1932), his "Population and Utilization of Land and Sea in Hawaii, 1853," *Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bul.* 88, 33 p. (1931), and his "The Oahu Sugar Cane Plantation, Waipahu," *Econ. Geogr.*, 9:60-71 (January, 1933).

Illinois: Stanley D. Dodge, "Sequent Occupance on an Illinois Prairie," *Geogr. Soc. Philadelphia Bul.*, 29:205-209 (July, 1931); ✓ Paul Wallace Gates, "Large Scale Farming in Illinois, 1850 to 1870," *Agr. Hist.*, 6:14-25 (January, 1932), and "The Disposal of the Public Domain in Illinois, 1848-1856," *Jour. Econ. and Business Hist.*, 3 (2):216-240 (February, 1931); a note on the Sibley estate in Ford County, Illinois, by Henry A. Wallace, *Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead*, 57:253 (April 30, 1932); ✓ Peter Nelson, *A History of Agriculture in Illinois, with Special Reference to Types of Farming* (Urbana, Ill., 1931. 20 p.), an abstract of a Ph.D. thesis at the University of Illinois, 1930.

Iowa: Peter L. and Marian Scanlan, "Basil Giard and His Land Claim in Iowa," *Iowa Jour. Hist. and Politics*, 30:219-247 (April, 1932); James B. Weaver, "The Story of 'The Des Moines River Lands,'" *Annals of Iowa*, October, 1932; Earl B. Shaw, "The Geography of a Small Trade Center in the Corn Belt," Monroe, Jasper County, Iowa, *Geogr. Soc. Philadelphia Bul.*, 29:265-279 (October, 1931); William J. Peterson, "Lexington of the North," *Palimpsest*, 13:333-394 (September, 1932), affording material on Charles W. Williams, Allerton, Axtell, and Rush Park.

Louisiana: H. P. Dart, "The First Cargo of African Slaves for Louisiana, 1718," *La. Hist. Quart.*, 14:163-177 (April, 1931); Ralph B. Flanders, "An Experiment in Louisiana Sugar, 1829-1833," *N. C. Hist. Rev.*, 9:153-162 (April, 1932).

Maryland: Paul H. Giddens, "Trade and Industry in Colonial Maryland, 1753-1769," *Jour. Econ. and Business Hist.*, 4:512-538 (May, 1932); Louis D. Scisco, "Baltimore County Land Records of 1670," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, 26:228-233 (September, 1931), and his "Baltimore County Records of 1671," *ibid.*, 27:123-128 (June, 1932).

Massachusetts: J. Herbert Burgy, "Land Utilization in the Greenfield, Massachusetts, Region as Affected by Geographic Conditions," *Bul. Geogr. Soc. Philadelphia*, 29:211-215 (July, 1931); Robert J. McFall, "Tendencies in Milk Production in Massachusetts," *Amer. Acad. Polit. and Social Sci., Annals*, 142:58-69 (March, 1929).

Minnesota: Verne E. Chatelain, "The Public Land Officer on the Northwestern Frontier," *Minn. Hist.*, 12:379-389 (December, 1931); A. F. Anglemeyer, "A History of Flour Milling in Brown County, Minnesota," *Northwest. Miller*, 171:386, 389, 391, 394 (August 10, 1932); C. E. Lively, "Growth and Decline of Farm Trade Centers in Minnesota, 1905-1930," *Minn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul.* 287, 48 p. (St. Paul, July, 1932).

New York: Warren G. Sherwood, "The Patroons of New Netherland," *N. Y. State Hist. Assoc. Quart. Jour.*, 12:271-294 (July, 1931); and Richard C. Ellsworth, "Northern New York's Early Co-operative Union," a communistic experiment at Potsdam, *ibid.*, 10:328-332 (October, 1929); Russell H. Anderson, "New York Agriculture Meets the West, 1830-1850," *Wis. Mag. Hist.*, 16:163-198, 285-296 (December, 1932, March, 1933); I. C. H. Cook, "Changing Agriculture," in New York, *Cornell Countryman*, 28:109-110, 119 (February, 1931).

North Dakota: Harold E. Briggs, "Early Bonanza Farming in the Red River Valley of the North," *Agr. Hist.*, 6:26-37 (January, 1932); William A. Titus, "Red River Valley Wheat: 1917," *Univ. N. Dak., Quart. Jour.*, Winter, 1932; A. E. and F. H. McCutcheon, "History of the Missouri River Diversion Project," *ibid.*, 22:377-387 (Summer, 1932).

Ohio: Paul W. Stoddard, "The Economic Progress of Ohio, 1800-1840," *Ohio Archaeological and Hist. Quart.*, 41:176-194 (April, 1932); "In the Golden Days of 1836," an editorial, *Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead*, 57:252 (April 30, 1932), the first purebred Shorthorn auction in the United States, October, 1832, on the Renick farm in Ohio; C. G. Williams, "The Ohio Station Has a Birthday," *Ohio Farmer*, 169:231, 237 (April 16, 1932).

Texas: T. J. Cauley, "Early Business Methods in the Texas Cattle Industry," *Jour. Econ. and Business Hist.*, 4:461-486 (May, 1932); J. Evetts Haley, editor, "James G. Bell; A Log of the Texas-California Cattle Trail, 1854," *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 35:208-237, 290-316, 36:47-66 (January-July, 1932); W. C. Holden, "Experimental Agriculture on the Spur Ranch, 1885-1904," *Southwest. Social Sci. Quart.*, 13:16-23 (June, 1932); Aldon S. Lang, "Financial Aspects of the Public Lands in Texas," *ibid.*, 13:57-68 (June, 1932), and his *Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas* (Waco, Texas, Baylor Univ., 1932. 250 p.), issued as *Baylor Bulletin* 35, no. 3, reviewed by R. I. Bieseke in the *Southwest. Hist. Quart.*, 36:170-171 (October, 1932); Mary Carter Toomey, "Pioneer Preserves County's History," *Farm and Ranch*, 51 (10):2, 20 (May 15, 1932), concerning G. A. Holland of Parker County.

Virginia: Archibald Henderson, "Dr. Thomas Walker and the Loyal Company of Virginia," *Amer. Antiquarian Soc. Proceedings* 41:77-178 (April 15, 1931); Arthur G. Peterson, "The Alexandria Market Prior to the Civil War," *William and Mary College Hist. Quart.*, 12:104-114 (April, 1932), and "Early Nineteenth Century Flour Prices," a statistical excursion into quotations at Alexandria, Va., 1815-1860, as compared with other United States figures, *Northwest. Miller*, 171:175, 188, 193, 197, 198, 200 (July 20, 1932); Kathleen Bruce, "Virginian Agricultural Decline to 1860: A Fallacy," *Agr. Hist.*, 6:3-13 (January, 1932); John Francis Ariza, "Dismal Swamp in Legend and History," *Natl. Geogr. Mag.*, 62:121-130 (July, 1932); Margaret A. Hitch, "Life in a Blue Ridge Hollow," of Virginia, *Jour. Geogr.*, 30:309-322 (November, 1931).